

REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the final Office Action dated December 30, 2003 and the Advisory Action dated March 30, 2004. In this Response, Applicants cancel claims 15-17, 22-23, 41-43, and 48-49 and traverse the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims. Silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections is not an acquiescence to such rejections. Specifically, silence with regard to Examiner's rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends from an independent claim that Applicants consider allowable for reasons provided herein, is not an acquiescence to such rejection of the dependent claims, but rather a recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicants' remarks and/or amendments relative to the independent claim (that Applicants consider allowable) from which the dependent claims depends. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application.

Claims 1-14, 18-21, 24-40, 44-47, and 50-52 are pending in the present application. The issues of the December 30, 2003 final Office Action and the March 30, 2004 Advisory Action are presented below with reference to the Office Action.

With regard to the Advisory Action: On June 9, 2004, Applicants' attorney spoke by telephone with Examiner Yuan about issues presented in the continuation sheet of item 5c of the Advisory Action. During the telephone call, Examiner Yuan indicated that the present application is not in condition for allowance because, as the continuation sheet indicated, independent claims 1 and 27 did not find support in page 15, lines 12-17, of the specification. Applicants respectfully note that Applicants never indicated that support for the independent claims was in the specification section cited by the Examiner.

For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants provide below each element of independent claim 1 and its corresponding support in the specification:

1. *A method for finding documents which relate to a portion of a temporal document, comprising:*
 - (a) *in response to a signal of interest at a particular time during the temporal document, identifying a portion of the temporal document for which related documents are to be found;*

"[Included] in the system is a technique which may be used, when a signal indicating interest in a portion of the [temporal] document is given, to facilitate the determination of the portion of the temporal document in which the interest has been indicated, by utilizing the time at which the signal indicating interest has been given." (specification, page 10, lines 16-19).

(b) selecting text associated with the portion of the temporal document identified;

"In the system described herein, the determination of what material may be related to the portion of the temporal document in which the user has indicated an interest may be made by using text associated with that portion of the temporal document which has been identified." (specification, page 12, lines 23-26).

(c) weighting each term in the selected text by a function $W(t)$ according to the time t at which the term occurs relative to the time at which the signal of interest occurs;

"In order to improve the relevance of the material thus selected, a term in the text which occurs at a time t relative to the time at which the interest has been indicated is weighted in the search query by the function $W(t)$." (specification, page 14, lines 24-26).

(d) finding the related documents by use of information retrieval techniques as applied to the weighted terms.

"The text associated with the portion of the temporal document which has been identified is used to locate other material that may be related to that portion of the temporal document in which interest has been indicated. This is done by using the associated text as a basis for a search query on a database of documents." (specification, page 14, lines 19-23)

Independent claim 27 recites the same subject matter and is supported by the same foregoing specification sections. Applicants thus consider the independent claims to be supported by the specification.

Because the only reason for rejection provided in the Advisory Action was a lack of support in the specification, Applicants consider such rejection to be traversed, and consider this Response to be fully responsive. Applicants thus consider all pending claims to be allowable, and also defer to the January 29, 2004 Response in providing justification for the allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants consider the Response herein to be fully responsive to the referenced Office Action. Based on the above Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (972) 718-4800.

Date: June 30, 2004

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
c/o Christian Andersen
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H14
Irving, TX 75038
Tel.: (972) 718-4800
CUSTOMER NO. 32127

Respectfully submitted,



Joel Wall
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,648